REMARKS

The Office Action of July 18, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 18-47 are pending and have been amended by this response. Claims 18–47 stand rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and remarks presented in this response.

Amended Claims

By this response, claims 18-47 are amended to clarify the intended scope. No new matter was added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 18-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, as noted above, claims 18-47 have been amended to clarify and more distinctly recite the intended scope of the claimed subject matter. In view of the above amendments, this ground of rejection is believed obviated.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 18-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,209,048 to Wolff ("Wolff") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,618,754 to Gosling ("Gosling").

While admitting that Wolff fails to disclose all the recited features of pending claims, the Examiner suggests that Gosling corrects the deficiency in Wolff. In particular, the Examiner suggests that it "would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize embedded executable scripts/applets in Wolff because it would have provided interactive controls of web pages displayed at the client." Applicants disagree with this suggested rationale for why a person of skill in the art would be motivated to combine Wolff and Gosling. Wolff discloses a sensor in communication with a processor, where the processor may receive requests from the network and provides commands to and controls the sensor in response to the requests. Wolff, Col. 7, ln. 5-21. In other words, Wolff discloses configuring the processor so that it provides the desired functionality for controlling the coupled sensor. In view of the straightforward manner in which Wolff functions (requests are received by the processor and the processor then provides commands to the sensor), there is no disclosed

need or benefit for embedding commands such as is disclosed by Gosling with a web page being provided on the processor of Wolff.

Furthermore, Wolff is directed toward the control of a sensor coupled to the processor, which is distinct from having a processor coupled to remote documents that may require unique resources to access, as disclosed by Gosling. Thus, no supported rationale has been provided for why a person of skill in the art would be motivated to modify the configuration of Wolff to include the features of Gosling – indeed, it appears that Wolf discloses that its processor is appropriately configured with sufficient interactivity to begin with, thus making the suggested rationale for modifying Wolff unsupported. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that a person of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Wolff to include the features of Gosling because the disclosure of Wolff and Gosling does not suggest that there would be a benefit in such a combination. Thus, for at least the above reasons, the combination of Wolff and Gosling fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the pending claims.

In addition, the cited references fail to disclose all the features of the pending claims. For example, claim 18 recites the feature of "the CPU configured to evaluate the obtained date and to generate signals in response to the evaluation of obtained data to the associated device." To the extent the Examiner feels the combination of Wolff and Gosling is proper, Wolff fails to disclose such a feature but instead merely discloses providing commands without an evaluation. Wolff, Col. 7, ln. 6-28. Thus, the cited references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 18 for this additional reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of all pending claims in the application is respectfully requested. All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2008

By:/Stephen L. Sheldon/
Stephen L. Sheldon

Registration No. 58,732
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001